

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

- 1.0 Introduction: No comments received
General Comments
- 2.0 Planning Methodology and Community Outreach Process
- 3.0 Land Use and Circulation Plan
- 4.0 Key Area Site Plans and Sustainability
- 5.0 Infrastructure Plan
- 6.0 Environmental Remediation Guidelines
- 7.0 Historic Preservation Guidelines: no comments received
- 8.0 Economic Implications and Community Impacts
- 9.0 Zoning/Land Use Impacts
- 10.0 Next Steps: Implementing the Vision
- 11.0 Existing Fort Monmouth Buildings Index: no comments received

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

General Comments		
Municipality	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	<p>1. The Reuse Plan fails to provide a viable means by which to replace 5,000 jobs directly lost by the closure of Fort Monmouth and the additional 15,000 jobs indirectly related to the operation of Fort Monmouth that will also be lost.</p>	<p>1. The Economic Revitalization Study conducted by Economics Research Associates (“ERA”) addresses a specific strategy to identify target industry clusters and the methodology to attract them. The work includes a series of principles which guide the business recruitment initiatives which cover short-term, mid-term, and long-term tactical actions for each of the strategic initiatives. This will be made public after final review by the Economic Work Groups.</p>
Oceanport	<p>2. The Reuse Plan does not incorporate the construction of thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility as previously recommended by the Mayor and Council, although such a facility is consistent with sound planning and land use, provides for Open Space and would complement a 1.1 billion dollars a year equine industry located at Monmouth Park Racetrack in the Borough in addition to providing approximately 300 permanent jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final Reuse Plan should include construction of a much needed thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility on the Oceanport lands located at Fort Monmouth consistent with both the need for a thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility as articulated by the New Jersey Racing Commission and the findings and conclusions articulated in Resolution #R-08-97 adopted by the Government Body of the Borough of Oceanport on June 19, 2008. • The construction of a thoroughbred horse training and stabling facility on part of the Oceanport lands located within Fort Monmouth is consistent with sound planning and land use principles in that it provides much needed open space for the Borough of Oceanport, the County of Monmouth, and the State of New Jersey.. • The EDC recommends that all elected officials do whatever is necessary to bring about the training facility in order to mitigate housing on Fort land. 	<p>2. No comment.</p>

Municipality Comments
 On the
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

General Comments		
Municipality	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	3. Who pays for the upkeep and services when the fence comes down? Where is Oceanport going to get the money initially to pay for the needed services? There should be some time period where the Government continues to monitor and maintain the property.	3. Fences will not come down until property disposition of specific parcels is complete. In the interim it remains Federal property and therefore maintenance is their responsibility.
Oceanport	4. Land worth Projections: The EDC is concerned with the Army's valuation assessment done on the Fort property 3 years ago. These numbers are out of date with the current market and are no longer realistic.	4. Acknowledged.

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Planning Methodology and Community Outreach Process			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	2.0	Density Transect is generally consistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Proposed Mass Transit is generally consistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Preliminary Traffic Improvement is not consistent with Vision Plan-intersection improvements at Eatontown Blvd (at Monmouth Road & Main St) are not indicated.	Intersection not studied; future investigation.
Oceanport	2.0	Blue/Green Belt is generally consistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Bike and Pedestrian Path is not inconsistent with Vision Plan.	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	2.0	Blur Boundary/Extend Land Use ins not entirely consistent with Vision Plan-Residential uses along Main Street and extension of use/streets from Eatontown neighborhood not included in Vision Plan.	Extension of streets has been changed on the Concept Plan.
Oceanport	2.0	Building Reuse Plan not entirely consistent with Vision Plan; however; Barker Circle buildings are indicated to be used for Oceanport Municipal Complex and housing, consistent with subsequent understandings.	Acknowledged.

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Land Use and Circulation Plan			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	3.0	Oceanport Reuse Area: No mention of homeless accommodations! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 400 apartments (multi/mixed use in 400 area and along Oceanport Ave.) is somewhat inconsistent with Vision Plan. Reuse of historic district structures for residential is consistent with Vision Plan. 	The entirety of the homeless accommodation plan is contained in the Homeless Application Submittal ("HAS"), which is available on our website.
Oceanport	3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 159 Single Family Detached dwellings along Main St are not consistent with Vision Plan 	FMERPA's plan can accommodate changes and EDAW has revised the text to provide for a combination of townhouses and small lot cottage detached homes.
Oceanport	3.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barker Circle buildings shown as MF housing – not consistent, but in line with discussions • Mixed-Use/Multi-Use is consistent with Vision Plan. • Office/R&D is consistent in its location, but less intense than Vision Plan. • Open Space/Recreation is consistent with Vision Plan. 	Acknowledged.
Oceanport	3.0	Reuse and Redevelopment Program has conflicting and incomplete information and should be clear regarding dwelling units, dwelling types, and non residential floor area	We disagree; it must retain flexibility. EDAW has completed and coordinated the program table.
Oceanport	3.0	Building Reuse index should be reviewed for accuracy, completeness and consistency with the Redevelopment and Reuse program (3-9) --- confusing and incomplete	EDAW reviewed and corrected.
Tinton Falls	3.0	Consistent with their Master Plan with Town Center concept and mix of retail and commercial; maximum of 4 stories	Acknowledged.
Tinton Falls	3.0	Limit access points onto Tinton Ave.	Limited to three existing gates opened and realignment of Pearl Harbor Road, no net increase in curb cuts on Tinton Avenue.
Tinton Falls	3.0	Realign High School access w/ Pearl Harbor	Agreed as shown in plan
Tinton Falls	3.0	Request early conveyance for implementation of plan	We concur in this possibility

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Land Use and Circulation Plan			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Tinton Falls	3.0	Request approval of PBC for municipal and county uses	We support
Eatontown	3.0	Plan is reasonable and consistent w/ Eatontown's Master Plan	Acknowledged
Eatontown	3.0	Accept the plan for Golf course and hotel	
Eatontown	3.0	Streets off Broad Street (Villa, Irving, Park) should be retained as limited access; perhaps making pedestrian and bike only	Plan has been revised to eliminate
Eatontown	3.0	Reinstate Nicodemus Avenue	Plan has been revised to reopen Nicodemus gate
Eatontown	3.0	Create rail line access to serve redevelopment area	To be determined
Eatontown	3.0	Open space should be permanently dedicated to Towns/County	We concur to County
Eatontown	3.0	Retain geothermal fields and add to service in other buildings	As planned
Eatontown	3.0	Create third lane along Avenue of Memories; Widen Rt. 35 along Frontage of Fort	For subsequent site planning
Eatontown	3.0	Create Exit 107 from GSP to project; Widen Tinton Ave. from Golf course side only	107 not feasible; concur w/ Tinton Avenue
Eatontown	3.0	Jitney should stay on primary streets such as Broad, Main, and Stevenson	Agree and plan has been modified. Final route will be developed w/ community input
Eatontown	3.0	Set up College Satellite	Plan includes educational facilities
Eatontown	3.0	More pedestrian and bicycle path ways; show connector walkway from downtown to Mallette Hall	Agree these connections are needed and will be developed collaboratively with the Municipality as the plan progresses

Municipality Comments
 On the
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Land Use and Circulation Plan (cont'd)			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Eatontown	3.0	Greenway connector from downtown to Wampum Park to Howard Commons	Off site is municipal planning
Eatontown	3.0	Street typology proposed does not meet NJ RSIS standards; compliance w/ Eatontown	Sections being revised, report text states to be RSIS compliant
Eatontown	3.0	Erroneously shows Throckmorton Ave. as Broad St. – correct error	Changed Typo
Eatontown	3.0	Eatontown should have retail on Rte. 35 side; medical/low density business along Avenue of Memories	Retail stores will face interior quad, final configuration will be established by redeveloper
Eatontown	3.0	Borough Hall should be placed in Mallette Hall	We concur
Eatontown	3.0	Citizens petition to eliminate the use of four local streets as access to the Fort	Concept Plan revised to eliminate through streets

Municipality Comments
 On the
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Key Area Site Plans and Sustainability			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	4.0	The Reuse Plan provides for single family lots where none are permitted in accordance with the Borough Master Plan for that zone.	Borough Master Plan Zoning is not applicable on Fort. There is no municipal zoning on Fort Monmouth – unclear meaning. EDAW has revised the text to allow flexibility in housing type in this area during plan development
Tinton Falls	4.0	Parking at proposed recreation and open space areas	Intentionally limited to streets and small municipal lot in the southeast corner of the park
Tinton Falls	4.0	Heyer Gruel asking for confirmation of the numbers	Confirmed

Infrastructure Plan			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	5.0	Infrastructure: Assumes all JCPL facilities (electric) is overhead – all new lines should be buried. Huge cost implications to pro forma of developer/economic feasibility	We acknowledge requirement and its cost implications; clearly a point of negotiation with the Army
Eatontown	5.0	Overhead wiring is not acceptable for new construction must be buried. Locations for new substations not shown	See above comment.

Municipality Comments
 On the
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Environmental Remediation Guidelines			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	6.0	Every and all effort should be made to mandate the Federal Government be primarily and fully responsible for the full land complete remediation of any and all environmental problems or issues and the full cost of same that stem from the Fort Monmouth property irrespective of any role or participation by the third parties on behalf of the Department of the Army or the Federal Government	Agreed. This is FMERPA's position
Oceanport	6.0	Environmental Issues: The EDC wants the environmental issues cleaned up and monitored by the Federal Government from "cradle to grave".	
Oceanport	6.0	The Final Reuse plan should utilize environmentally friendly "green" principles and procedures wherever and whenever possible in the redevelopment and reuse of the Fort property.	LEED principles are part of our guidelines
Eatontown	6.0	No contaminated site should be turned over to town; all cleanup completed or issuance of NFA before release of Open Space; No future cost to taxpayers of Eatontown	Agreed, this is FMERPA's position

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Economic Implications and Community Impacts			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	8.0	Tax Incentives: The EDC strongly recommends that the State consider giving tax abatements to companies who move into Fort Monmouth in order to mitigate the housing and increases the business aspect of reuse.	Economic Revitalization Study addresses this
Oceanport	8.0	Approval process: The EDC recommends that the approvals for building in Oceanport lie in Oceanport.	Each community will be involved in the process
Oceanport	8.0	The financial projection reflect a negative (\$7000.00) tax impact annually after 10 years but a \$64,000 surplus annually after twenty years. The plan does not explain the key financial and economic assumptions used to support these conclusions. These numbers appeared flawed as the do not account for the financial burdens of infrastructure repair and maintenance, the cost of a new school and any tax incentives or PILOTS that would likely have to be granted to attract business to the Fort Monmouth properties.	We acknowledge the initial tax impact of (\$7,000.00) per annum, but that can be mitigated by control of what is disposed of (property) by the Federal Government, and when. There is no impact until the parcels are disposed of, and the Developer Agreements are struck.
Oceanport	8.0	Tax Incentives: The EDC strongly recommends that the State consider giving tax abatements to companies who move into Fort Monmouth in order to mitigate the housing and increases the business aspect of reuse.	The Economic Revitalization Study addresses the issue of incentives
Oceanport	8.0	Approval process: The EDC recommends that the approvals for building in Oceanport lie in Oceanport.	Local input and participation is integral to redevelopment
Oceanport	8.0	The Board does not accept as accurate and EDAW and FMERPA should further re-evaluate the data and background calculations that formulate the basis behind the assumptions of anticipated revenue generation found in its Final Plan and allow for the independent revenue and analysis by the Borough to the extent possible.	A full review has been conducted and we believe the data and assumptions are reasonable and can be attained
Oceanport	8.0	The Board does not accept as accurate and EDAW and FMERPA should further re-evaluate the accuracy of the revenue generators and revenue generation data in the EDAW proposed model and financials calculations.	See above
Oceanport	8.0	The Board does not accept as accurate and EDAW and FMERPA should further re-evaluate the accuracy of the calculations and data behind the projected tax impact conclusions found in the EDAW and Final Reuse and Development of Fort Monmouth Plan	A complete review has been conducted and we feel confident that our conclusions can be attained

Municipality Comments
 On the
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Economic Implications and Community Impacts			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	8.0	Fiscal Impacts: these are not favorable to Oceanport, even in the most favorable scenarios. The worst case should be evaluated. The removal of the SFD dwellings may make a big difference. Does not address affordable housing obligations/costs.	COAH Obligations are being addressed and a commit letter has been requested
Eatontown	8.0	Lacks economic incentives to stimulate growth; needed for incubator space in Eatontown	Contained in Economic Revitalization Study
Eatontown	8.0	Should consider shorter time frame for recovery	Acknowledged and desired
Eatontown	8.0	Reserves comment on revenue sharing	Post Plan submittal Topic

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Zoning/Land Use Plans			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	9.0	Zoning: The EDC strongly suggests that final zoning for the Fort lie with Oceanport and not FMERPA	Zoning will be reviewed with each municipality
Oceanport	9.0	The Final Reuse Plan should make every reasonable effort to insure that no building shall be higher than three stories in height.	That can be addressed as part of Future Zoning/Site Plan reviews
Oceanport	9.0	The Final Reuse Plan should create and implement traffic flows and road designs that provide for an east west flow of traffic through the Fort property towards Route 35.	Addressed in Plan
Oceanport	9.0 10.0	The Final Plan should include every reasonable mechanism not inconsistent with the FMERPA enabling legislation to allow for local input, participation, and control with respect to future planning and zoning decisions and approvals necessitated or required by the implementation of the Final Plan.	Local input and participation is integral to the Plan
Oceanport	9.0	The Reuse Plan has an adverse impact on the Borough as it related to Affordable Housing obligations and the regulatory requirements of the Council on Affordable Housing and recently enacted legislation.	COAH obligations are not yet established, but we do not expect this statement to be true
Oceanport	9.0	Does not adequately address affordable housing obligations/costs.	See above
Oceanport	9.0	The Final Re-use Plan should specifically acknowledge and insure that replacement jobs created for any lost employment jobs are considered solely replacement employment that does not generate additional COAH obligations under any COAH job creation guidelines or formulas.	This is exactly our position with COAH and is in writing
Oceanport	9.0	Barkers Circle: Can we reuse the existing apartments to get credit for our COAH obligations?	Being requested
Oceanport	9.0	COAH and Affordable Housing issues: Why is Oceanport getting the lion's share of affordable housing obligations? Can they be split among the 3 towns?	Any COAH obligation would be applied across the entire development on the appropriate formula
Oceanport	9.0	The Reuse Plan places an unfair burden on the Borough placing within it a disproportionate share of Homeless accommodations as it relates to the certified county need.	Statement is incorrect, as it pertains to burden
Oceanport	9.0	Why the homeless shelters are only mentioned in Oceanport? Shouldn't these be distributed among the 3 towns	The homeless obligation is shared proportionately among the three towns.

Municipality Comments
On the
Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Zoning/Land Use Plans			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Tinton Falls	9.0	Wants local control and implementation of plan through municipal oversight	Each town will be involved in decision making
Tinton Falls	9.0	Must have written confirmation on COAH's treatment of Growth Share component; must be tied to jobs lost both at the Fort and Support (Contractor)	This is the position we have taken w/ COAH and await response
Tinton Falls	9.0	Design criteria on residential to ensure minimal impact on local schools	Will be established going forward
Tinton Falls	9.0	Ensure that there is adequate housing stock which is "Work Force Affordable" above COAH requirements	We agree; design criteria
Tinton Falls	9.0	Local Control emphasized to avoid over burdening of schools	We have met w/ school boards and planned accordingly
Eatontown	9.0	Clarification of the type of housing units at Howard Commons necessary	Specifics to be issued
Eatontown	9.0	Retain "dead end" streets without making them through streets after fence comes down	Addressed in revision of the Concept Plan
Eatontown	9.0	Reliability of COAH numbers within the three community's, as well as, for the redevelopment area; need "special region" guidelines in writing	Have requested same
Eatontown	9.0	Planning and Zoning Boards should retain jurisdiction for development applications	Local input and review integral
Eatontown	9.0	Upscale restaurants should have liquor licenses available – need more	Municipal issue
Eatontown	9.0	Number of school age children challenged as not being realistic; insufficient data	Data has been reviewed and confirmed
Eatontown	9.0	New dwelling units should be owner occupied; too many apartments in Eatontown now	Acknowledged and text changed in the Final Report
Eatontown	9.0	Make corrections in the table which shows the count f various dwelling units for each town	Reviewed and corrections made
Eatontown	9.0	Incubator concept challenged; not much success in New Jersey	Acknowledged, but we believe we have a special situation.

Municipality Comments
 On the
 Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan
 Final Draft Plan dated 30Jun08

Next Steps: Implementing the Vision			
Municipality	Section	Comment	FMERPA Staff Position on Comment
Oceanport	10.0	The Reuse Plan has incorporated by reference Ratable Sharing Models and Shared Service proposals that are beyond the scope and authority of FMERPA and will have a negative impact on the Quality of Life and financial stability of the Borough.	Revenue sharing should be discussed post Plan submission. Shared services study formulated to give towns options supported by data at no expense to towns- not mandated.
Eatontown	10.0	If HUD makes changes to homeless requirement, town wants review of new demand	We acknowledge.
Eatontown	10.0	Insist that all buildings except those planned for retention should be knocked down	Federal Government decision.